

कि आयात तथा निर्यात व्यापार नियंत्रण संगठन के मन् १९५६ के वार्षिक प्रशासन प्रतिवेदन के पृष्ठ ५४ पर बताई गई वस्तुओं पर लगाये गये निर्यात प्रतिबन्धों का भारत की आर्थिक नीति पर क्या प्रभाव पड़ा है ?

†[EFFECT OF EXPORT RESTRICTIONS ON THE ECONOMIC POLICY

*572. SHRI RAM SAHAI: Will the Minister of COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY be pleased to state what has been the effect of the export restrictions imposed on the commodities shown at page 54 of the Annual Administration Report of the Import and Export Trade Control Organisation for the year 1956, on the economic policy of India?]

वाणिज्य मंत्री (श्री एन० कानूनगो) : हालांकि इन निर्यात-प्रतिबंधों का लगाने में कुछ विदेशी मुद्रा की हानि हुई है, लेकिन इनके कारण देश में लोगों को ज्यादा माल मिल सका है और जरूरी चीजों के भाव स्थिर रखने में मदद मिली है।

†[THE MINISTER OF COMMERCE (SHRI N. KANUNGO): Though these export restrictions have resulted in certain loss of foreign exchange, these have helped to safeguard supplies for the domestic consumer and to steady the prices of essential commodities.]

श्री राम सहाय : क्या सरकार इस बात पर कोई विचार कर रही है कि इस श्रेणी में कुछ और वस्तुएं शामिल की जाय या कुछ हटा ली जाय ?

श्री एन० कानूनगो : इसमें हटाने की कोशिश है ताकि ज्यादा निर्यात किया जाय और हमें एक्सचेंज मिल सके।

†[] English translation.

REVIEW OF THE SECOND FIVE YEAR PLAN

*544. SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Will the Minister of PLANNING be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have completed the review of the Second Five Year Plan; and

(b) if so, what are the features of the review and the decisions taken?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF PLANNING (SHRI S. N. MISHRA): (a) and (b). The Planning Commission has been engaged in reviewing the Second Five Year Plan with a view to drawing up the Development Plan for 1958-59 in the light of the present assessment of external and internal resources and various priorities. The Plan is being reviewed only in broad terms in relation to the five-year period as a whole.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: May I know whether the Government is aware that the Finance Minister and other Ministers of the Government as well as officers who are directly connected with the Planning Commission are airing their views publicly with regard to the phasing, curtailment and other matters relating to the Plan, and whether such statements are being made in consultation with the Planning Commission or the Minister of Planning?

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: It is not correct to say that the Finance Minister is not an integral part of the Planning Commission. In fact, he is a member of the Planning Commission and he is one of the most competent persons to speak on this subject.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What about the other part of the question—airing views on this subject?

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: Well, Sir, when we need some air, we air our views; and I am afraid the hon Member sets us the example because he does it so often and so we attempt to flatter him by imitating him.

The point really is this and the question he has asked I would like to answer. So far as the Plan for 1958-59 is concerned we have, more or less, set our targets and details are being filled in and at the present moment the Planning Commission is engaged in discussions with various State Governments about fixing the plan priorities and the plan expenditure and what amount of assistance must be given by the Centre. So far as the Central planning is concerned, the work is going on and the schemes are being finalised for fitting them in with the budget. With regard to the question of what may be called the rephrasing of the Plan or in whatever form it is mentioned, I had mentioned it in the other House and I would like to repeat it here, taking this opportunity with your kind permission, that while it does seem that there may be one or two power projects which have to be cut down—I thought at one time some fertilizer projects might have to be cut down—it does not look as if that would be absolutely necessary now and we may be able to go through with them now. I had promised the other House and I repeat the promise here, that we will be able to give a near precise picture of what the Plan will be, some time during the budget session. For the time being, we are thinking in terms of having an investment of about Rs 4.800 crores.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Apart from announcements or suggestions about curtailment of certain schemes or projects, is the hon. Minister aware that the statement had been made in the United States of America that the rate of development of the private sector would be twice as much as that of the public sector? And whether such a statement had been authorised or whether if the statement had been made, the Planning Commission took cognizance of it and if so, what are their reactions?

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: Sir, this has nothing to do with the

Planning Commission or the Plan. The private sector, at any rate, a very large part of it, is not controlled by the Plan, except where investment comes in and I do repeat that it is a matter of opinion. I feel, if in the public sector development is fast, then the rate of development in the private sector will be as two is to one, because what my hon. friend has in mind when he mentions private sector may not be what I have in mind. The private sector means different industries, large industries, medium industries, small industries and self-employed craftsmen. What we have to think of in terms of investment in the public sector which is not labour intensive is, how much resultant employment comes out of it. And today economic thought lays greater stress on what may be called the secondary and tertiary stages of employment potential and I think that is a perfectly correct opinion to hold. That is my opinion. If the public sector develops, still the rate as compared to the private sector will be as one is to two. It is not a question that has anything to do with economic planning or plan policy. My hon. friend may feel that if the public sector develops, the rate of development of the private sector should be only half. He is entitled to that opinion.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Apart from this, the statement had been made in the same country, the U.S.A. again, by some responsible members, by personalities functioning under the Government that only those industries which do not bring in or yield profits immediately would be reserved for the public sector, whereas the development in those industries which bring profits would be all left to the private sector? If such a statement had been made, whether it is not contrary to the objectives set forth in the Planning Commission as well as to the latest Industrial Policy Resolution of April 1956?

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: Again, Sir, it is really a question of

the hon. Member applying his mind to the problem. These processing industries, they have larger profit margins. The basic industries cannot have such large profit margins whatever, whether it be private sector or the public sector. For the steel industry, they fix 8 per cent. return *en bloc* and I do not think it will ever go beyond 10 per cent. even if we allow some more money to be ploughed in for development. Similar is the case of the cement industry and some of the big industries which are connected with the nation-building purposes. They have a relatively lower profit margin whereas in the processing industries the profit may be anything that the traffic will bear. I think the position is, while the basic industries that have been chosen by Government are industries where profits have necessarily to be limited, there is no such limit so far as the private sector is concerned. The question of limiting profits arises there from a complaint by consumers. If an industry is of a monopolistic character, then the consumers are entitled to complain and then the Tariff Commission will interfere. That is a statement of fact and not an expression of opinion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question No. 546, Mr. Amolakh Chand.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Sir, I was authorised by Mr. Bhanj Deo to put his question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That will come up later on. Now Mr. Amolakh Chand to put question No. 546 on behalf of Shri Nawab Singh Chauhan. Yours will be later and it will be 12 o'clock by that time.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: But I have been authorised by Mr. Bhanj Deo and his question happens to come before.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Where is that authorisation? We have not received any such authorisation.

दिल्ली के राजकीय प्रेस की संसदीय शाखा के लिये मशीनें

*५४६. श्री अमोलख चंद (श्री नवाब सिंह चौहान का ओर से) : क्या निर्माण, आवास और संभरण मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) दिल्ली के राजकीय प्रेस की संसदीय शाखा के लिये कितनी व कितने मूल्य की मशीनें खरीदी गई थीं ;

(ख) इन में से अब तक कितनी मशीनों से पूर्ण व आंशिक रूप से काम लिया गया है ;

(ग) इनमें से कितनी मशीनें बाहर भेजी जा रही हैं और क्यों ; और

(घ) इस संसदीय शाखा सम्बन्धी नियोजन का कौन अधिकारी जिम्मेदार है ?

†[MACHINES FOR PARLIAMENTARY WING OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS, DELHI]

*546. SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND (ON BEHALF OF SHRI NAWAB SINGH CHAUHAN): Will the Minister of WORKS, HOUSING AND SUPPLY be pleased to state:

(a) the number of machines purchased for the Parliamentary Wing of the Government of India Press, New Delhi, and the cost thereof;

(b) how many of these machines have so far been fully and partially utilized;

(c) how many of them are being sent out and for what reasons; and

(d) the authority which is responsible for the planning of the Parliamentary wing?]

THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF WORKS, HOUSING AND SUPPLY (SHRI ANIL K. CHANDA): (a) One hundred and five machines at a cost of Rs. 37.4 lakhs.

†[] English translation.